



W.M. Norr 1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): W.M. Norr

Case: 1

Serial No.: 09/364,432

Filing Date: July 30, 1999

Group: 2172

Examiner: Monplaisir G. Hamilton

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signature: 

Date: June 8, 2004

Title: Information Delivery in a Multi-Stream Digital Broadcasting System

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

RECEIVED

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

JUN 15 2004

Technology Center 2100

Sir:

The remarks below are submitted in response to the final Office Action dated March 8, 2004 in the above-identified application. A Notice of Appeal is submitted concurrently herewith.

REMARKS

The present application was filed on July 30, 1999 with claims 1-38. Claims 1-38 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 15, 29, 31, 33-35 and 37 are the independent claims.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected each of claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,026,164 (hereinafter "Sakamoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,267,021 (hereinafter "Ramchandran") or in further combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,740,246 (hereinafter "Saito").

In this response, Applicant respectfully traverses the §103(a) rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Applicant initially notes that a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that the cited references when combined must "teach or suggest all the claim limitations," and that there be some